

AGENDA

Commuter Rail Committee Meeting

December 18, 2008

12:00 p.m.

Location

SANBAG Office

Super Chief Conference Room

1170 West 3rd St., 2nd Fl.

San Bernardino, CA

Commuter Rail Committee Membership

Chair

Mayor Pro Tem Patricia Gilbreath
City of Redlands

Mayor Paul Leon
City of Ontario

Vice Chair

Mayor Paul Eaton
City of Montclair

Mayor Patrick Morris
City of San Bernardino

Mayor Kelly Chastain
City of Colton

Council Member Larry McCallon
City of Highland

Council Member Bea Cortes
City of Grand Terrace

Council Member Diane Williams
City of Rancho Cucamonga

San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) is a council of governments formed in 1973 by joint powers agreement of the cities and the County of San Bernardino. SANBAG is governed by a Board of Directors consisting of a mayor or designated council member from each of the twenty-four cities in San Bernardino County and the five members of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors.

In addition to SANBAG, the composition of the SANBAG Board of Directors also serves as the governing board for several separate legal entities listed below:

***The San Bernardino County Transportation Commission**, which is responsible for short and long range transportation planning within San Bernardino County, including coordination and approval of all public mass transit service, approval of all capital development projects for public transit and highway projects, and determination of staging and scheduling of construction relative to all transportation improvement projects in the Transportation Improvement Program.*

***The San Bernardino County Transportation Authority**, which is responsible for administration of the voter-approved half-cent transportation transactions and use tax levied in the County of San Bernardino.*

***The Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies**, which is responsible for the administration and operation of a motorist aid system of call boxes on State freeways and highways within San Bernardino County.*

***The Congestion Management Agency**, which analyzes the performance level of the regional transportation system in a manner which ensures consideration of the impacts from new development and promotes air quality through implementation of strategies in the adopted air quality plans.*

*As a **Subregional Planning Agency**, SANBAG represents the San Bernardino County subregion and assists the Southern California Association of Governments in carrying out its functions as the metropolitan planning organization. SANBAG performs studies and develops consensus relative to regional growth forecasts, regional transportation plans, and mobile source components of the air quality plans.*

Items which appear on the monthly Board of Directors agenda are subjects of one or more of the listed legal authorities. For ease of understanding and timeliness, the agenda items for all of these entities are consolidated on one agenda. Documents contained in the agenda package are clearly marked with the appropriate legal entity.

**San Bernardino Associated Governments
County Transportation Commission
County Transportation Authority
Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
County Congestion Management Agency**

Commuter Rail Committee Meeting

**December 18, 2008
12:00 p.m.**

Location: SANBAG Office, 1170 West 3rd St., 2nd Fl., San Bernardino

R.S.V.P. by Monday, December 15th to Daylene at (909) 884-8276

CALL TO ORDER

(Meeting Chaired by Mayor Pro Tem Patricia Gilbreath)

- I. Attendance
- II. Announcements
- III. Agenda Notices/Modifications - Daylene Burris

1. Possible Conflict of Interest Issues for the Commuter Rail Committee Meeting of December 18, 2008 Pg. 6

Note agenda item contractors, subcontractors and agents, which may require member abstentions due to conflict of interest and financial interests. Committee Member abstentions shall be stated under this item for recordation on the appropriate item.

Notes/Actions

Consent Calendar

2. Commuter Rail Committee Attendance Roster Pg. 7

A quorum shall consist of a majority of the membership of each Policy Committee, except that all County Representatives shall be counted as one for the purpose of establishing a quorum.

Discussion Items

3. Measure I 2010-2040 Draft Strategic Plan Pg. 9 Metrolink/Passenger Rail and Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit Sections and Policies

Review and provide comment on the Measure I 2010-2040 Draft Strategic Plan Metrolink/Passenger Rail and Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit Sections and Policies. **Mike Bair**

4. Fiscal Year 2010 Federal Appropriations Pg. 23

Approve projects and prioritization for Fiscal Year 2010 Federal Appropriations as listed in Attachment #1. **Jennifer Franco**

5. Guidelines for Identifying Potential Projects for the Pg. 38 MultiYear Federal Transportation Reauthorization Bill

1. Approve guidelines for identifying potential projects for Federal Reauthorization (Attachment #1); and
2. Receive update on input from SANBAG's policy committees. **Jennifer Franco**

6. Release of the Draft Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan Pg. 42 for Comment

Receive information on the Draft Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan Report and opening of the formal comment period. **Steve Smith**

Public Comments

7. Additional Items from Committee Members

8. Brief Comments by the General Public

Additional Information

Acronym List Pg. 44

ADJOURNMENT

Complete packages of the SANBAG agenda are available for public review at the SANBAG offices and our website: www.sanbag.ca.gov. Staff reports for items may be made available upon request. For additional information call (909) 884-8276.

Meeting Procedures and Rules of Conduct

Meeting Procedures

The Ralph M. Brown Act is the state law which guarantees the public's right to attend and participate in meetings of local legislative bodies. These rules have been adopted by the Board of Directors in accordance with the Brown Act, Government Code 54950 et seq., and shall apply at all meetings of the Board of Directors and Policy Committees.

Accessibility

The SANBAG meeting facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. If assistive listening devices or other auxiliary aids or services are needed in order to participate in the public meeting, requests should be made through the Clerk of the Board at least three (3) business days prior to the Board meeting. The Clerk's telephone number is (909) 884-8276 and office is located at 1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino, CA.

Agendas – All agendas are posted at 1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. Staff reports related to agenda items may be reviewed at the SANBAG offices located at 1170 W. 3rd Street, 2nd Floor, San Bernardino and our website: www.sanbag.ca.gov.

Agenda Actions – Items listed on both the "Consent Calendar" and "Items for Discussion" contain suggested actions. The Board of Directors will generally consider items in the order listed on the agenda. However, items may be considered in any order. New agenda items can be added and action taken by two-thirds vote of the Board of Directors.

Closed Session Agenda Items – Consideration of closed session items *excludes* members of the public. These items include issues related to personnel, pending litigation, labor negotiations and real estate negotiations. Prior to each closed session, the Chair will announce the subject matter of the closed session. If action is taken in closed session, the Chair may report the action to the public at the conclusion of the closed session.

Public Testimony on an Item – Members of the public are afforded an opportunity to speak on any listed item. Individuals wishing to address the Board of Directors or Policy Committee Members should complete a "Request to Speak" form, provided at the rear of the meeting room, and present it to the Clerk prior to the Board's consideration of the item. A "Request to Speak" form must be completed for *each* item an individual wishes to speak on. When recognized by the Chair, speakers should be prepared to step forward and announce their name and address for the record. In the interest of facilitating the business of the Board, speakers are limited to three (3) minutes on each item. Additionally, a twelve (12) minute limitation is established for the total amount of time any one individual may address the Board at any one meeting. The Chair or a majority of the Board may establish a different time limit as appropriate, and parties to agenda items shall not be subject to the time limitations.

The Consent Calendar is considered a single item, thus the three (3) minute rule applies. Consent Calendar items can be pulled at Board member request and will be brought up individually at the specified time in the agenda allowing further public comment on those items.

Agenda Times – The Board is concerned that discussion take place in a timely and efficient manner. Agendas may be prepared with estimated times for categorical areas and certain topics to be discussed. These times may vary according to the length of presentation and amount of resulting discussion on agenda items.

Public Comment – At the end of the agenda, an opportunity is also provided for members of the public to speak on any subject within the Board's authority. *Matters raised under "Public Comment" may not be acted upon at that meeting. "Public Testimony on any Item" still apply.*

Disruptive Conduct – If any meeting of the Board is willfully disrupted by a person or by a group of persons so as to render the orderly conduct of the meeting impossible, the Chair may recess the meeting or order the person, group or groups of person willfully disrupting the meeting to leave the meeting or to be removed from the meeting. Disruptive conduct includes addressing the Board without first being recognized, not addressing the subject before the Board, repetitiously addressing the same subject, failing to relinquish the podium when requested to do so, or otherwise preventing the Board from conducting its meeting in an orderly manner. *Please be aware that a NO SMOKING policy has been established for meetings. Your cooperation is appreciated!*

**SANBAG General Practices for Conducting Meetings
of
Board of Directors and Policy Committees**

Basic Agenda Item Discussion.

- The Chair announces the agenda item number and states the subject.
- The Chair calls upon the appropriate staff member or Board Member to report on the item.
- The Chair asks members of the Board/Committee if they have any questions or comments on the item. General discussion ensues.
- The Chair calls for public comment based on “Request to Speak” forms which may be submitted.
- Following public comment, the Chair announces that public comment is closed and asks if there is any further discussion by members of the Board/Committee.
- The Chair calls for a motion from members of the Board/Committee.
- Upon a motion, the Chair announces the name of the member who makes the motion. Motions require a second by a member of the Board/Committee. Upon a second, the Chair announces the name of the Member who made the second, and the vote is taken.

The Vote as specified in the SANBAG Bylaws.

- Each member of the Board of Directors shall have one vote. In the absence of the official representative, the alternate shall be entitled to vote. (Board of Directors only.)
- Voting may be either by voice or roll call vote. A roll call vote shall be conducted upon the demand of five official representatives present, or at the discretion of the presiding officer.

Amendment or Substitute Motion.

- Occasionally a Board Member offers a substitute motion before the vote on a previous motion. In instances where there is a motion and a second, the maker of the original motion is asked if he would like to amend his motion to include the substitution or withdraw the motion on the floor. If the maker of the original motion does not want to amend or withdraw, the substitute motion is not addressed until after a vote on the first motion.
- Occasionally, a motion dies for lack of a second.

Call for the Question.

- At times, a member of the Board/Committee may “Call for the Question.”
- Upon a “Call for the Question,” the Chair may order that the debate stop or may allow for limited further comment to provide clarity on the proceedings.
- Alternatively and at the Chair’s discretion, the Chair may call for a vote of the Board/Committee to determine whether or not debate is stopped.
- The Chair re-states the motion before the Board/Committee and calls for the vote on the item.

The Chair.

- At all times, meetings are conducted in accordance with the Chair’s direction.
- These general practices provide guidelines for orderly conduct.
- From time-to-time circumstances require deviation from general practice.
- Deviation from general practice is at the discretion of the Board/Committee Chair.

Courtesy and Decorum.

- These general practices provide for business of the Board/Committee to be conducted efficiently, fairly and with full participation.
- It is the responsibility of the Chair and Members to maintain common courtesy and decorum.

Adopted By SANBAG Board of Directors January 2008

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
 ■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 1

Date: December 18, 2008

Subject: Information Relative to Possible Conflict of Interest

Recommendation*: Note agenda items and contractors/subcontractors which may require member abstentions due to possible conflicts of interest.

Background: In accordance with California Government Code 84308, members of the Board may not participate in any action concerning a contract where they have received a campaign contribution of more than \$250 in the prior twelve months from an entity or individual. This agenda contains recommendations for action relative to the following contractors:

Item No.	Contract No.	Contractor/Agents	Subcontractors
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Financial Impact: This item has no direct impact on the budget.

Reviewed By: This item is prepared monthly for review by the Board of Directors and Policy Committee members.

*Approved
Commuter Rail Committee*

Date: _____

Moved: _____ *Second:* _____

In Favor: _____ *Opposed:* _____ *Abstained:* _____

Witnessed: _____

COMMUTER RAIL POLICY COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE RECORD – 2008

Commuter Rail Policy Committee Meetings are held on odd months

Name	Jan**	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Patricia Gilbreath City of Redlands			X				X		X	X	X	
Bea Cortes City of Grand Terrace (Appointed May 2007)			X						X	X	X	
Kelly Chastain City of Colton (Appointed February 2007)					X		X		***	X		
Paul Eaton City of Montclair			X		X		X		X	X	X	
Paul Leon City of Ontario (Appointed April 2007)					X		X			X	X	
Larry McCallon City of Highland (Appointed June 2007)			X		X		X		X	X	X	
Patrick Morris City of San Bernardino (Appointed May 2006)			X		X		X		X	X	X	
Diane Williams City of Rancho Cucamonga			X		X		X		X	X	X	

**Commuter Rail Committee Did Not Meet

***John Mitchell was present for the City of Colton

X = Member attended meeting.
CRCATT08

* = Alternate member attended meeting. Empty box = Member did not attend meeting

Crossed out box = Not a member at the time.

COMMUTER RAIL POLICY COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE RECORD – 2007

Commuter Rail Policy Committee Meetings are held on odd months

Name	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Pat Gilbreath City of Redlands	X		X		X		X		X		C	
Bea Cortes City of Grand Terrace (Appointed May 2007)	X		X		X		X		X		A	
Kelly Chastain City of Colton (Appointed February 2007)	X				X		X				N	
Robert Christman City of Loma Linda	X		X		X		X		X		C	
Paul Eaton City of Montclair			X		X		X		X		E	
Paul Leon City of Ontario (Appointed April 2007)	X		X		X		X		X		L	
Larry McCallon City of Highland (Appointed June 2007)	X		X		X		X		X		L	
Patrick Morris City of San Bernardino (Appointed May 2006)	X		X		X		X				E	
Diane Williams City of Rancho Cucamonga	X		X		X		X		X		D	

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 3

Date: December 18, 2008

Subject: Measure I 2010-2040 Draft Strategic Plan Metrolink/Passenger Rail and Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit Sections and Policies

Recommendation:* Review and Provide Comment on the Measure I 2010-2040 Draft Strategic Plan Metrolink/Passenger Rail and Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit Sections and Policies.

Background: Beginning last July the Commuter Rail Committee has been providing policy direction relating to the development of two expenditure programs authorized in the Measure I 2010-2040 Expenditure Plan; the Metrolink/Passenger Rail Program and the Express Bus and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Program.

The Committee gave early approval in July of proceeding with the Express Bus and BRT Program as a "Pay-As-You-Go" program for at least the first ten years because of the limited amount of revenue (2%) that will be made available. Consideration of possibly using financing mechanisms would be considered once the SANBAG Board determines the amount of revenue allocated to this program (could be up to 10%) after the first ten years.

*

*Approved
Commuter Rail Committee*

Date: _____

Moved:

Second:

In Favor:

Opposed:

Abstained:

Witnessed: _____

CRC0812a-mab
35209000
Attachments:
CRC0812a1-mab
CRC0812a2-mab
CRC0812a3-mab
CRC0812a4-mab

The Committee also gave early direction for the development of the Metrolink/Passenger Rail Program, including setting some early prioritization of expenditure categories, phasing of project delivery, and the elimination of some projects altogether. The Committee reviewed a "Pay-As-You-Go" and a financing alternative as well as the further development of project prioritization. In November the Committee approved the re-scoping of the Metrolink/Passenger Rail Program, the prioritization of project expenditure categories and moving forward with a financing scenario.

Subsequent to the Committee's action and direction, staff has prepared the attached Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan sections and policies relating to the above two expenditure programs. Staff is seeking comment from the Committee on the draft material being presented.

Financial Impact: This item has no financial impact. The staff work effort for the development of these two draft sections and their respective policies is provided for under Tasks 30909000 – General Transit and 35209000 – General Commuter Rail. The funding source for both tasks is LTF - Planning.

Reviewed By: This item will be reviewed by the Commuter Rail Committee on December 18, 2008.

Responsible Staff: Michael Bair, Director of Transit and Rail Programs

San Bernardino Associated Governments	Policy	40000-VMPR
Adopted by the Board of Directors Month Day, Year	Revised	m/d/yyyy
Valley Metrolink/Passenger Rail Program Measure I 2010 – 2040 Strategic Plan	Revision No.	0

Important Notice: A hardcopy of this document may not be the document currently in effect. The current version is always the version on the SANBAG website.

Note: This notice is only in effect when policy is posted to the SANBAG website.

Table of Contents

| Purpose | References | Definitions | Revision History |

Note: This area is used to link to bookmarks inserted in the main paragraph headings.

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to delineate the requirements for administration of the Valley Metrolink and Passenger Rail Program for Measure I 2010-2040. The policy establishes the funding allocation process, reimbursement mechanisms, project eligibility, and limitations on eligible expenditures.

II. REFERENCES

Ordinance No. 04-01 of the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, Exhibit A – Transportation Expenditure Plan

III. DEFINITIONS

Short Range Transit Plan (S RTP) – A five-year financially constrained plan of projected transit service levels, operating and capital improvement expenses, updated biennially and submitted to SANBAG by local transit systems, including the passenger rail program.

IV. POLICIES FOR THE VALLEY SUBAREA METROLINK AND PASSENGER RAIL PROGRAM

A. Organization of the Valley Metrolink and Passenger Rail Program

Policy VMPR-1: The Valley Metrolink and Passenger Rail Program shall follow the intent of Ordinance 04-01, i.e., to provide funding for capital improvements for the Metrolink commuter rail operations serving San Bernardino County; to establish a new passenger rail service operating between the cities of San Bernardino and Redlands; and to extend the LA Metro Gold Line to the Montclair Transit Center.

Policy VMPR-2: Eight percent (8%) of the revenue collected within the Valley subarea shall be apportioned to the Metrolink and Passenger Rail Program account.

B. Eligible Expenditures

Policy VMPR-3: The following expenditures shall be eligible under the Valley Metrolink and Passenger Rail Program:

- Metrolink - The purchase of additional commuter rail passenger cars and locomotives for use on Metrolink lines serving San Bernardino County; the construction of additional track capacity necessary to operate more Metrolink trains serving San Bernardino County; matching federal and state funds used to maintain the railroad track, signal systems, and road crossings for passenger rail service.
- Redlands Passenger Rail - The acquisition of equipment, construction and operation of a new passenger rail service connecting the cities of San Bernardino and Redlands. It is anticipated that Metrolink will be the lead agency for the construction project and will operate the service.
- LA Metro Gold Line - The construction and operation of an extension of the LA Metro Gold Line to the Montclair Transit Center. It is anticipated that the Metro Gold Line Foothill Extension Construction Authority will be the lead agency for the construction project and LA Metro will be the operator..

C. Allocation of Valley Metrolink and Passenger Rail Program Funding

Policy VMPPR-4: The SANBAG Board of Directors shall annually allocate funding to specific transit projects and programs as approved in the Passenger Rail SRTP.

Policy VMPPR-5: Allocations to a specified project or program shall be limited to the annual forecast of revenues available within the Valley, unless there is also a residual balance of revenue available.

D. Disbursement of Valley Metrolink and Passenger Rail Program Funds

Policy VMPPR-6: Funds approved for allocation by the SANBAG Board for Metrolink capital improvement projects shall be consistent with the annual apportionment agreed to by the SANBAG Board and identified in the adopted Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) budget. Funds shall be disbursed to SCRRA within thirty (30) days of the receipt of each quarterly invoice.

Policy VMPPR-7: Funds approved by the SANBAG Board for the Redlands passenger rail project shall be allocated to SCRRA in the amount identified in the annual adopted SCRRA budget and agreed to by the SANBAG Board. Funds shall be disbursed within thirty (30) days of the receipt of each quarterly invoice.

Policy VMPPR-8: Funds approved by the SANBAG Board for allocation for Metro Gold Line extension to the Montclair Transit Center shall be allocated to the Metro Gold Line Construction Authority (Authority) in the amount identified in the Authority's annual adopted budget and agreed upon by the SANBAG Board. Funds shall be disbursed within thirty (30) days of the receipt of each quarterly invoice.

V. REVISION HISTORY

Revision No.	Revisions	Adopted
0	Adopted by the Board of Directors.	mm/dd/yyyy
1	Provide list of changes.	mm/dd/yyyy

SPlan__Section-4-2-7_ValleyMetrolink/Passenger Rail

4.2.7 Valley Metrolink and Passenger Rail Program

4.2.7.1. Introduction and Scope of Program

Eight percent (8%) of the revenue collected in the Valley Subarea shall be made available to the Metrolink/Passenger Rail Program. Eligible expenditures include: the purchase of expansion commuter rail passenger cars and locomotives for use on Metrolink lines serving San Bernardino County; construction of additional track capacity necessary to operate more Metrolink passenger trains; construction of Metrolink station expansion parking; provide local funds for State and Federal funds used to maintain the railroad track, signal systems, and road crossings; construction and operation of a new passenger rail service between the cities of San Bernardino and Redlands; and the construction and operation of an extension of the LA Metro Gold Line to the Montclair Transit Center.

4.2.7.2. Financial Analysis of Program

The basis for determining the cost of this program included the incorporation of information contained in the 2010-2030 Strategic Assessment prepared by the Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink) developed in 2006 and preliminary cost estimates for the two projects named in the Expenditure Plan (Gold Line Extension and Redlands Passenger Rail). Due to financial constraints, many of the projects contained in the Metrolink plan for 2030 were extended out to 2040. The initial proposed program cost totaled over \$3.1 billion. It is important to note that the proposed program did not include additional capital projects likely to be needed before 2040, such as the replacement of initial acquisition of Metrolink locomotives and passenger cars; the rehabilitation of the Metrolink Central Maintenance and Operations facilities; and the possible extension of the Gold Line to the Los Angeles/Ontario International Airport.

The projection of federal formula funds totaling \$561.8 million (Section 5307 Fixed Guideway and 5309 Rail Modernization) are based on historical trends. A significant amount of CMAQ and STIP funds (totaling \$364.6 million and \$53.4 million) have been identified to support the acquisition of additional passenger rail cars, the construction of additional parking at the Metrolink stations and meet the Board's previous commitment to the Redlands passenger rail project. The use of CMAQ funds for transit purposes is consistent with the previous Board policy (approved April 2, 2003). The revenue forecast includes fifty percent (50%) FTA New Starts match for the Gold Line Extension to Montclair and \$75 million from the FTA Small Starts match for the Redlands passenger rail project. And, finally, the amount of LTF and STA included (totaling \$193.5 and \$120.2 respectively) is considered to be a reasonable expectation for rail capital purposes. Other minor funding is to be provided from the State Proposition 1B PTMISEA and the local Rail Asset Fund.

The initial forecast of total revenues available was \$2.2 billion, resulting in a shortfall of nearly \$900 million. The shortfall required the consideration of moving project scheduling and the elimination of some projects altogether, such as those involving the IEOC and Riverside Lines because of the inability to add passenger trains under the current agreements with the private railroads over which these two lines operate.

In July 2008 the Commuter Rail Committee provided direction for project scheduling and authorized the exploration of “Pay-As-You-Go” and financing scenarios. The Committee requested that, since the Gold Line Extension involves the approval of LA Metro that is by no means certain at this time, investment in this project be deferred until the completion of the Redlands passenger rail project. The result of the first scenario was presented to the Commuter Rail Committee in September 2008. This scenario require an unacceptable delay in the scheduled implementation of both the Redlands Passenger Rail and the Gold Line Extension Projects, extended the schedules for several of the Metrolink capital improvement projects and required the elimination of others altogether. The financing scenario was presented to the Commuter Rail Committee in October 2008. It included the issuance of \$220 million in bonds over four transactions between 2009 and 2019. Even with this scenario, the schedule for the Redlands Passenger Rail and Gold Line Extension were delayed another year and several of the proposed Metrolink capital improvements projects were dropped.

In October the Commuter Rail Committee recommended approving the re-scoping of the passenger rail program and prioritization of capital investments to allow for a financially feasible plan for delivering the Valley Metrolink/Passenger Rail Program. The Committee also recommended the use of bonding to accelerate the delivery of need passenger rail projects with specific bonding proposals to be developed as part of the Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan.

The table below provides an estimate of the amount of program funds (inflated) that will be made available over the thirty-year period (2010-2040).

San Bernardino Valley	2010-2040 Revenue Estimate
Metrolink/Passenger Rail Program	\$940,578,005

4.2.7.3 Program Policies

The Valley Metrolink/Passenger Rail Program framework has received conceptual approval by the Commuter Rail Committee. There is the recognition that, unlike the Valley Freeway or Interchange Programs where projects are constructed and then turned over to the State for maintenance, the adequate investment in the rehabilitation and renovation of the existing railroad infrastructure and equipment is a high priority for SANBAG. In addition, since the Metrolink stations are jointly owned by SANBAG and the cities, the provision of funding for the expansion of parking will be critical to insure continued growth in ridership. Contributions shall be sought

from the local jurisdictions should special treatments or landscaping be desired as part of the station improvement project. The annual contribution of non-federal funds into the revenue equipment (locomotives and passenger cars) replacement fund at SCRRA is also important in order to avoid a much larger one-time contribution when the replacement of aging equipment comes up. These types of investments were all considered a priority by the Commuter Rail Committee early during the review of the Program.

As noted above, in October the Commuter Rail Committee recommended the re-scoping of the passenger rail program and the prioritization of capital investments contained in the financing scenario. The following parameters were considered as part of the development of the financing scenario:

- Federal transit formula funds (Sections 5307 Fixed Guideway and 5309 Rail Modernization) would be used primarily to support the Metrolink renovation and rehabilitation program.
- Local Transportation Funds, State Transit Assistance funds and Measure I Rail funds would be used to match federal formula funds.
- Congestion Mitigation Air Quality and State Transportation Improvement Program funds would be used to support the acquisition of new rolling stock (passenger cars and locomotives) and Metrolink/Passenger Rail station parking (new or expansion) as well as fulfilling prior SANBAG Board commitments to the Redlands passenger rail project.
- Bonds, totaling more than \$220 million, would be issued four times over the next ten years.

The Committee also approved the following recommended priority for project delivery:

- Ongoing Rehabilitation and Renovation
- Phased Metrolink Station Improvements
- Ongoing Equipment Replacement Fund
- SCRRA 2010 San Bernardino Line Projects, Sealed Corridor and Extension of Metrolink to "E" Street.
- SCRRA 2015 San Bernardino Line Projects, LAUS Renovation, Eastern Maintenance Facility, Positive Train Control and Sealed Corridor
- Redlands Passenger Rail
- Metro Gold Line Extension to Montclair

- SCRRRA 2020 San Bernardino Line Projects, LAUS Renovation, Eastern Maintenance Facility, Bridge over LA River, Shortway Double track, North Riverside Station, and Sealed Corridor
- SCRRRA 2030 San Bernardino Line Projects
- SCRRRA Rolling Stock 2020 and 2030¹

A critical component to the allocation of funds to Metrolink line specific and system-wide projects will be agreement amongst the other SCRRRA member agencies to participate financially with those projects. The extension of the Metro Gold Line will also require agreement with LA Metro to fund their portion of the extension and operate the service.

4.2.7.4 Implementation Actions

The following actions are needed to implement the Valley Metrolink/Passenger Rail Program:

- Establish a monitoring system for the amount and availability non-Measure I revenues anticipated in the passenger rail program.
- Establish a project cost monitoring system to reflect potential changes as project development occurs.
- Develop a tracking system for the Valley Metrolink/Passenger Rail Program expenditures and revenues, integrated or interfaced with the SANBAG financial system.

¹ To be funded with CMAQ and STIP revenues

San Bernardino Associated Governments	Policy	40000- VEB
Adopted by the Board of Directors	Month Day, Year	Revised
Valley Express Bus & Bus Rapid Transit Program Measure I 2010 – 2040 Strategic Plan	Revision No.	m/d/yyyy 0

Important Notice: A hardcopy of this document may not be the document currently in effect. The current version is always the version on the SANBAG website.

Note: This notice is only in effect when policy is posted to the SANBAG website.

Table of Contents Purpose References Definitions Revision History Note: This area is used to link to bookmarks inserted in the main paragraph headings.
--

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to delineate the requirements for administration of the Valley Express Bus & Bus Rapid Transit Program for Measure I 2010-2040. The policy establishes the funding allocation process, reimbursement mechanisms and project eligibility

II. REFERENCES

1. Ordinance No. 04-01 of the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority, Exhibit A – Transportation Expenditure Plan

III. DEFINITIONS

Short Range Transit Plan (S RTP) – A five-year financially constrained plan of projected transit services levels, operating and capital improvement expenses, updated biennially and submitted to SANBAG by local transit systems.

Express Bus Service – Limited stop regularly scheduled bus service operating over State highways and/or freeways and taking advantage of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes where available.

Bus Rapid Transit Service – A flexible, high performance rapid transit mode that combines a variety of physical, operating and system elements into a permanently integrated system with a quality image and unique identity¹.

IV. POLICIES FOR THE VALLEY EXPRESS BUS & BUS RAPID TRANSIT PROGRAM

A. Organization of the Valley Express Bus and Bus Rapid Transit Program

Policy VEB-1: The policies for the Valley Subarea Express Bus and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Program shall follow the intent as contained in Ordinance 04-01, i.e., the development, implementation and operation of express bus and bus rapid transit, to be jointly developed by the Authority and transit service agencies serving the Valley Subarea.

Policy VEB-2: Upon the initial collection of revenue this Program shall receive two percent (2%) of the revenue collected in the Valley Subarea. Effective ten years following the initial collection of revenue, the amount of revenue made available to this Program shall increase to at least five percent (5%), but not more than ten percent (10%) upon approval by the Authority Board. The Valley Major Streets Program shall be reduced by a like amount. Amendments beyond those

authorized in the Expenditure Plan shall require a formal amendment as provided by the ordinance.

B. Eligible Expenditures

Policy VEB-3: Eligible projects shall include contributions to operating and capital costs associated with implementing high-speed, express-type bus service in high density travel corridors, as defined by the terms "Express Bus" and "Bus Rapid Transit" above. Capital cost shall include: the purchase of revenue vehicles and accessories; the construction of BRT stations, including the purchase and installation of prepaid fare media and custom shelters; the construction of dedicated BRT guideways; and the purchase and installation of BRT ITS applications such as next bus notification and traffic signal prioritization. The cost of construction projects shall be phased, i.e., preliminary engineering and environmental documentation, right of way acquisition and construction.

C. Project Selection and Prioritization

Policy VEB-4: The first project to receive an allocation from this Program will be the Omnitrans "E" Street *sbX* Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project. In Fiscal Year 2007-2008, Omnitrans received authorization from the Federal Transit Administration to enter into the Project Development Phase for the "E" Street BRT project utilizing funds made available from the FTA Small Starts Capital Investment Grant Program. All of the revenue collected for the Program through Fiscal Year 2011-2012 shall be made available to the "E" Street BRT project.

Policy VEB-5: The Authority and Omnitrans staff shall confer on a biennial basis, beginning in Fiscal Year 2010-2011, to determine whether the creation of Sub-Programs for Express Bus and BRT should be recommended to the Authority Board. Such a recommendation shall take into consideration the conversion of existing no-cost cooperative service agreements with external transit agencies providing express bus service into the Valley, as well as any new cooperative service agreements, to a cost-reimbursement cooperative agreement that includes the sharing of passenger revenue and any beneficial impact such a conversion would have on the Omnitrans farebox recovery ratio and the amount of additional federal formula funds that would be apportioned to the Valley.

Policy VEB-6: The Long Range Transit Plan, currently under development, will identify and prioritize feasible BRT corridors.

Policy VEB-7: The criteria for selecting BRT corridors for funds shall include:

- Existing ridership
- Connectivity between key trip generators
- Geographic coverage of major residential areas and activity centers
- Potential for market penetration and growth in future transit demand
- Potential to provide superior service to long-distance transit riders
- Potential to positively influence community development/redevelopment and support the creation of livable communities
- Transit dependency based on demographic and land use patterns.
- Cost effectiveness of the project (annualized operating and capital cost/transit user benefit).
- Extent to which other revenue sources are included in the project financial plan, including corridor city and private development contributions.

Policy VEB-8: A key consideration shall be the willingness of the corridor jurisdictions to provide for higher-intensity transit oriented development to occur in the immediate vicinity of the proposed BRT stations, including adoption of required zoning and general plan land use designations prior to the corridor project receiving funding.

D. Allocation of Valley Subarea Express Bus and Bus Rapid Transit Program Funds

Policy VEB-9: The SANBAG Board of Directors shall annually allocate funding to specific Express Bus and BRT projects as approved in the Omnitrans SRTP.

E. Disbursement of Valley Subarea Express Bus and Bus Rapid Transit Funds

Policy VEB-10: Funds allocated for Express Bus operating expenses, whether directly operated or covered under a cost-reimbursement and revenue sharing cooperative service agreement, during any given Fiscal Year shall be disbursed quarterly in arrears. The disbursement of funds will occur within thirty (30) days of the receipt of a quarterly invoice documenting the total operating expenses incurred and passenger revenue received for the quarter.

Policy VEB-11: Funds allocated for Express Bus capital expenses shall be disbursed within thirty (30) days of the receipt of a copy of the procurement invoice for capital items.

Policy VEB-12: Funds allocated for BRT capital projects shall be disbursed within thirty (30) days of the receipt of a copy of either the procurement invoice for capital items or documentation of progress payments made during the preliminary engineering and environmental documentation, right of way acquisition and/or construction phases.

Policy VEB-13: Funds allocated for BRT operating expenses during any given Fiscal Year shall be disbursed quarterly in arrears. The disbursement of funds will occur within thirty (30) days of the receipt of a quarterly invoice documenting the total operating expenses incurred and passenger revenue received for the quarter.

¹ Levinson et al., **Bus Rapid Transit – Implementation Guidelines, TCRP Report 90-Volume II**

V. REVISION HISTORY

Revision No.	Revisions	Adopted
0	Adopted by the Board of Directors.	mm/dd/yyyy
1	Provide list of changes.	mm/dd/yyyy

SPlan_Section-3-3-2-8_ValleyExpressBus-BRT

3.3.2.8 Valley Express Bus & Bus Rapid Transit

3.3.2.8.1 Introduction and Scope of Program

Within the first ten years two percent (2%) of the revenue apportioned to the Valley shall be made available for the development, implementation, and operation of express bus and bus rapid transit (BRT) jointly developed by the Authority and transit service agencies serving the Valley Subarea. Eligible projects shall include contributions to operating and capital cost associated with implementing high-speed, express-type bus service in high density corridors. Effective ten years following the initial collection of revenue, funding for this program shall increase to at least five percent (5%), but no more than ten percent (10%) upon approval by the Authority Board. Any additional funding provided for this program shall be drawn from the Valley Major Streets Projects Program. Amendments beyond those authorized for this Program shall require a formal amendment as provided by the ordinance.

3.3.2.8.2 Program Policy Framework

In July 2004 Omnitrans prepared a system-wide transit corridor plan for the San Bernardino Valley. The plan identified seven (7) broad corridors through which a higher level of transit service, known as Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), would be considered. From that plan the “E” Street corridor was selected as the first corridor for which the required federal Alternatives Analysis (AA) phase would be conducted. The completion of the AA phase resulted in the selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative of BRT for the 16-mile corridor stretching from north of Cal State University to the VA Hospital in Loma Linda. Omnitrans submitted a grant application for this project under the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Small Starts Capital Investment Program. The grant was approved and Omnitrans has entered into the Project Development Phase. The preliminary cost estimate for the project is \$163 million (2006 \$’s).

SANBAG is in the process of completing the development of a Long Range Transit Plan (LRTP) for the San Bernardino County. The transit network for the San Bernardino Valley has refined the initial seven broad corridors and added two more for a total of nine (9) potential BRT corridors. The LRTP is considering the following corridors for BRT:

- “E” Street (from north of Cal State University to Loma Linda University and the VA Hospital)
- Foothill Boulevard East (from Fontana Metrolink Station to Highland)
- Foothill Boulevard West (from the Montclair Metrolink Station to Fontana Metrolink Station)
- Euclid Avenue (from Foothill Boulevard in Upland to the Corona Metrolink Station)

- San Bernardino Avenue (from Fontana Kaiser Hospital to San Bernardino Transit Station)
- Holt Boulevard/4th Street (from downtown Pomona Metrolink to Fontana Kaiser Hospital)
- Grand/Edison Avenues (from Cal Poly Pomona to Limonite Shopping Center)
- Sierra Avenue (from I-15 to Fontana Kaiser Hospital)
- Riverside Avenue (from Sierra Avenue to downtown Riverside)

The combined length of the nine corridors is 131 miles. Should all nine corridors be found to be viable corridors, approximately \$1.3 billion in 2006 dollars would be required. The FTA Small Starts grant programs could provide up to \$75 million for each corridor or \$675 million for all nine. Other revenue sources likely to be tapped for BRT projects include: FTA formula bus funds, CMAQ, State Transit Assistance, STIP PTA funds, Proposition 1B - PTMISEA, Local Transportation Funds, Measure I Valley Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit, Traffic Management Systems, and Local Streets Projects, and private development contributions.

This program can also provide funding for supporting existing and new express bus service operating within or into the San Bernardino Valley. Omnitrans currently operates one express bus connecting the downtowns of San Bernardino and Riverside. However, Omnitrans has entered into several no-cost transit service cooperative agreements with other transit agencies operating into the Valley, such as Foothill Transit, Orange County Transportation Authority, Riverside Transit Agency and Mountain Area Regional Transit Agency. Consideration will be given to whether these agreements should be converted to a cost and revenue sharing agreement, especially if by doing so, the ratio of passenger revenue and local support for Omnitrans would be increased. SANBAG and Omnitrans will also need to confer periodically to determine whether new express bus services that might be established both within and into the Valley should be considered for funding from this Program.

The table below provides an estimate of the amount of program funds (inflated) that will be made available over the thirty-year period (2010-2040) at the 2%/5% and 2%/10% levels.

San Bernardino Valley	2010-2040 Revenue Estimate
Express Bus/BRT @ 2% and 5%	\$530,487,646
Express Bus/BRT @ 2% and 10%	\$1,013,149,691

3.3.2.8.3 Program Policy Framework

As this is a new expenditure program under the Measure I Extension, new policies have to be developed. The policies do build upon the early considerations that have been made with respect to the implementation of the first BRT project in the Valley – the “E” Street *sbX* project and direction given by the Commuter Rail Committee in July 2008 and the Strategic Plan Ad Hoc

Committee during its August 2008 meeting. Principally due the limited amount of revenues made available during the first ten years, the consensus of both Committees is to initially treat this program as a “Pay as You Go” program. Once the Board decides the extent of the increase in revenues directed to this program (2020), the consideration of expediting project delivery through possible financing options should be undertaken. With the adoption of the Omnitrans Fiscal Year 2008-2012 Short Range Transit Plan, the Board has committed revenues apportioned to this Program through Fiscal Year 2011-2012 to the “E” Street sbX project. The policies are attached as Policy 40000-VEBBRT.

3.3.2.8.4 Program Implementation Actions

The following actions will be necessary in order to implement the Valley Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit Program:

- Within this program, there is no indication of what amount of funding should be made available for express bus or bus rapid transit projects. The Boards of SANBAG and Omnitrans may wish to consider establishing an overall threshold for each type of transit service.
- Currently, Omnitrans provides one express bus route (Route 215) connecting the downtowns of San Bernardino and Riverside. The ability of Omnitrans to implement additional express bus service may be limited because the proposed construction of HOV lanes on the freeway system within the Valley does not include provision of drop lanes (dedicated lanes connecting the HOV lane with significant local arterial streets). The lack of having drop lanes available means that buses using the HOV lanes would be required to merge across several conventional freeway lanes to exit and enter the HOV lanes – a difficult maneuver and one that would negatively impact service reliability.
- Omnitrans does have several no-cost cooperative service agreements with other transit systems that do offer express-type service to the Valley residents; such as Foothill Transit, Orange County Transit Authority, Riverside Transit Agency and the Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority. The potential exists to increase the number of transit agencies providing service from outlying areas within San Bernardino County into the Valley over time. The Board and Omnitrans may wish to reconsider the structure of these agreements to include a cost and revenue sharing, especially if an improvement to the Omnitrans farebox recovery ratio would be the result. A decision would need to be made as to whether the cost of providing express bus transit service into the San Bernardino Valley should, through revisions to the Omnitrans cooperative service agreements, be eligible for this funding program.

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 4

Date: December 18, 2008

Subject: Fiscal Year 2010 Federal Appropriations

Recommendation:* Approve projects and prioritization for Fiscal Year 2010 Federal Appropriations as listed in Attachment #1.

Background: The U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) recently updated figures showing that the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) received \$3 billion less than it collected in Fiscal Year (FY) 2008. The primary federal funding source for transportation projects is derived from the federal excise tax on gasoline, which is transferred to the HTF. Funding for federal transportation programs is adjusted, as needed, based on the solvency of the HTF.

Due to the diminishing revenues in the HTF, SANBAG encourages the Board to advocate for a permanent solution to keep the fund solvent. Additionally, SANBAG encourages the Board to continue advocating for the same projects submitted to Congress for inclusion in the annual Transportation, Housing and Urban Development (THUD) appropriations bill. Continuing support for such projects will illustrate the region's commitment to these projects.

Approved
Commuter Rail Committee

Date: _____

Moved: _____ *Second:* _____

In Favor: _____ *Opposed:* _____ *Abstained:* _____

Witnessed: _____

The projects listed in Attachment #1, reflect SANBAG's commitment to address hours of delay and congestion relief along two major highway corridors – those corridors being I-10 and I-15. Additionally, the attached project list represents projects that might be eligible for specialized funds and includes projects that will provide a regional benefit. Also, during November's Administrative Committee meeting, Committee Members recommended the inclusion of a project in Congressman Miller's district since no other project was identified within his jurisdiction. The project recommended for inclusion in SANBAG's FY 2010 appropriations list was Chino Corona Road, which is a critical motorist safety project (please note: a project description of this project is provided in Attachment #1).

Please recognize that when a list of projects is submitted to Congress, SANBAG officials will be asked by our delegation offices to rank them in priority order. Last year, the Board approved prioritizing projects for Senator Dianne Feinstein and Senator Barbara Boxer; however, prioritization is also necessary for all project submittals to our House of Representatives.

Attachment #1 is organized in priority order per Congressional Member. The justification for the recommended priority order for FY 2010 appropriations corresponds with SANBAG's approved projects for the state's Proposition 1B, Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF) and projects that are eligible for specialized funds.

For projects submitted to Senator Feinstein and Senator Boxer, typically only two to three projects are accepted. As such, the SANBAG staff recommends submitting the following projects (listed in priority order):

1. I-15 Corridor: Devore Interchange Improvements
2. I-10 Corridor: Cherry/Citrus Improvement Project
3. High Desert Corridor: Phase I/Interchange Project

A Primer on the Annual Federal Appropriations Process

The annual federal appropriations process will begin in late January and it is directly linked to the annual discretionary spending decisions made by Congress. Each year, 12 different federal appropriations bills are used to formulate the federally approved budget. Based on this structure, SANBAG seeks funds from the annual THUD appropriations bill. Starting in 2009, Congress will be working on the FY 2010 THUD bill.

SANBAG's Evaluation of the Appropriations Process

Each year, SANBAG is guided by its board approved legislative platform to seek legislative remedies for transportation policy and funding of transportation infrastructure projects. Additionally, SANBAG annually adopts a list of specific projects to advocate for as a part of the federal appropriations process. Since the passage of SAFETEA-LU, SANBAG staff – along with the assistance of Van Scoyoc Associates, SANBAG's federal advocates – has tracked a trend whereby earmarks for discretionary funding provided by the annual appropriations process continue to be extremely competitive.

- FY 2007: Congress did not complete a transportation appropriations bill, choosing to fund programs through a year-long Continuing Resolution. In the absence of legislation, discretionary spending was left to the Department of Transportation.
- FY 2008: SANBAG received over \$4 million in earmarked funds in the transportation appropriations bill. This was in addition to the FY 2008 funding provided by SAFETEA-LU, the current surface transportation bill.
- FY 2009: Congress passed a Continuing Resolution which funds the federal government through March 5th. House and Senate Appropriations conferees are expected to work to pass final versions of the FY 2009 bills in January.

SANBAG's Congressional delegation includes Senator Feinstein, Senator Boxer, Congressman Baca, Congressman Dreier, Congressman Lewis, Congressman McKeon and Congressman Miller. For the FY 2008 THUD appropriations bill, most of our Congressional delegates supported one to three of this region's requests for discretionary funds. At time of print for this agenda item, no funding decisions have been made by Congress for the FY 2009 THUD appropriations bill.

Current Political Factors Affecting the Appropriations Process

During this past legislative cycle, the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission, also known as the 1909 Commission, issued a report that provided recommendations to Congress to increase the federal role for transportation infrastructure. The report's recommendations for a \$0.25-\$0.40

federal gas tax increase was criticized by the Administration and some in Congress, signaling possible resistance to identifying revenue that will adequately fund transportation infrastructure needs for maintenance and new construction.

- The result of the recent elections will create changes in committee assignments and a change of legislative priorities. The extent of these changes is not yet known.
- Transportation as a federal priority continues to fall below other legislative priorities in Congress, such as the recent banking crisis.
- The Highway Trust Fund continues to fall short of funding needs as mandated by SAFETEA-LU. The fund was nearly bankrupt in September.
- If earmarks are provided in a given THUD appropriations bill, the number and the amount of such earmarks continues to shrink.

The Board's review of the projects listed above should be mindful that the annual appropriations process is extremely competitive and that projects submitted to Congress for federal appropriation are typically smaller requests than projects submitted for the multi-year transportation authorization bill.

SANBAG staff recommends including all projects listed above in the SANBAG advocacy effort for FY 2010 Appropriations.

Financial Impact: Funding for SANBAG's legislative program is consistent with the adopted SANBAG Budget Task No. 50309000. This item might have a potential positive impact on SANBAG's transportation programs.

Reviewed By: This item is scheduled for review by the Commuter Rail Committee on December 18, 2008 and the Mountain/Desert Committee on December 19, 2008 and was reviewed and unanimously recommended for approval by the Administrative Committee on December 10, 2008. Previously in November, this item was reviewed by the Administrative Committee, the Commuter Rail Committee, and the Mountain Desert Committee.

Responsible Staff: Jennifer Franco, Director of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs

ATTACHMENT #1

SANBAG STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

FY 2010 Federal Appropriations Cycle

During recent SANBAG Board meetings, Board members have stressed the importance of advocating for federal funds in a systematic approach, particularly in cases where federal funds might be used to leverage state funds, such as Proposition 1B and Measure I monies. The federal appropriations process is just one opportunity to seek funds from the federal government and, typically, Congressional members would like the money to be expended during the year funds are allocated. Mindful of the Board's direction, and in preparation for the next appropriations cycle for federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2010, the following projects are recommended for inclusion in SANBAG's Federal Advocacy Plan:

FY 2010 Federal Appropriations – SANBAG Staff Recommendation

Congressional District	Project	Amount Requested
Baca	I-10 Corridor: Cherry/Citrus Improvement Project	\$3 million
Baca	San Bernardino Rapid Bus Project: sbX	\$4 million
Dreier	I-15 Corridor: Base Line Interchange	\$3 million
Lewis	Needles Highway (Public Lands Funds)	\$5 million
Lewis	I-15 Corridor: Ranchero Rd. Interchange	\$3 million
Lewis	Victor Valley Transit Facility	\$3 million
McKeon	I-15 Corridor: Devore Interchange Improvements	\$5 million
McKeon	High Desert Corridor: Phase I/Interchange Project	\$5 million
McKeon	I-15 Corridor: La Mesa Nisqualli Interchange	\$5 million
Miller	Motorist Safety Project: Chino Corona Road	\$3 million

SANBAG STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

FY 2010 Federal Appropriations Cycle

Public Lands Highway Discretionary Program

- *Needles Highway*
\$5 million (Lewis)

Project Description

Needles Highway is primarily a two-lane rural highway that runs North and South between the City of Needles and Laughlin, Nevada. Improvements to the highway are necessary for improved motorist safety, to reduce road flooding and wash-outs. Previously the State of Nevada had allocated \$14 million to the project, \$7 million of which is to be spent on the California segments. Because of increased project costs, NDOT rescinded the \$7 million that was programmed for the California side to fund construction on the Nevada side of the highway. Discussions with Nevada are taking place to reprogram the Nevada contributions to the project.

Project History

SANBAG has allocated \$2,478,840 of Surface Transportation Program formula funds to the project, and the project has received \$5,834,701 in allocation of Public Lands and Highways funds. The project is included in SANBAG's Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

Project Status

The environmental approval should be complete by September 2009. Currently the project is funded through the environmental and design phases.

Budgetary Estimate Summary (in \$000's)

Project Phase PA&ED

Construction Start Date 2010

Est. Total Project Cost: \$60 million

Funding Summary

Surface Transportation Program \$2,478,840

Public Lands \$5,834,701

SANBAG STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

FY 2010 Federal Appropriations Cycle

Interstate Maintenance Program

- ***I-10 Corridor: Cherry/Citrus Improvement Project***
\$3 million (Baca)

Project Description

The portion of the I-10 Corridor that is located in San Bernardino County currently has the single greatest amount of vehicular delay of any interchange within the 43rd Congressional District and provides access to the heavy industrial areas of Ontario, Fontana, Rialto, Colton and San Bernardino County. This project will make operational and safety improvements to the city of Fontana. This project will increase traffic capacity along I-10 and greatly reduce traffic congestion. Additionally, the Cherry/Citrus Interchange Improvement Project will:

- Replace the existing five-lane Cherry Ave. bridge over I-10 with an eight-lane bridge and add one lane to each ramp
- Replace the existing four-lane Citrus Ave. bridge over I-10 with a seven-lane bridge and add one lane to each ramp
- Widen the existing Cherry Ave. bridge over the Union Pacific railroad from four lanes to eight lanes
- Widen the existing Citrus Ave. bridge over the Union Pacific railroad from three lanes to six lanes
- Provide improvements at the Cherry–Slover Intersection and improve the Cherry–Valley Intersection

Project History

The CTC approved the TCIF Baseline Agreements for these projects at its Oct 2008 meeting.

Project Status

Final Design (Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)) started in May 2008 “at risk” and is ongoing. Final design started prior to environmental approval is considered at risk. SANBAG is the lead agency for PS&E. Environmental phase (Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED)) is also ongoing concurrently with final design. PA/ED approval for Citrus Interchange is expected by the end of Nov 2008. PA/ED approval for Cherry Interchange is expected by March 2009. Both interchanges are recipients of TCIF funding for construction. The California Transportation Commission approved the Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF) Baseline Agreements for these projects at its October 2008 meeting.

Budgetary Estimate Summary (in \$000's)

Study Report	Fontana/Caltrans
Project Report	Fontana/County/Caltrans
Project Phase	PA/ED with concurrent Final Design
Construction Start Date	Citrus: April 2011 Cherry: August 2011
Number of possible jobs	100
Project Cost	Citrus: \$55 million Cherry: \$78 million

Est. Total Project Cost: \$133 million (in 2010 dollars)

Funding Summary (in \$000's)

State – STIP	\$3,908
State – TCIF	\$30,773
County	\$3,242
Measure I	\$1,823
Various – to be resolved	\$36,368
Total:	\$76,114

SANBAG STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

FY 2010 Federal Appropriations Cycle

- ***I-15 Corridor: Base Line Road Interchange***
\$3 million (Dreier)

Project Description

The Base Line Rd./I-15 Interchange is located just North of I-15/Foothill Blvd. Interchange -- the most congested segment of I-15 between I-10 and Las Vegas. Current planned improvements include two new bridge structures for the Southbound on/off ramps and constructing a loop ramp for Westbound Base Line Rd. to Southbound I-15. The project includes the replacement of the existing East Ave. overhead structure located North of the interchange, widening Base Line Rd. to provide two left turn lanes for Eastbound Base Line to the Northbound I-15.

Project History

The City has already invested \$6.2 million in local funds for right-of-way acquisition and \$1 million for preliminary engineering. All technical studies for the EIR have been completed and approved by Caltrans.

Project Status

SANBAG staff recommends requesting \$3 million for this project, which is an increase in comparison to last year's request amount of \$1.5 million. A higher request amount is being sought for this project due to an increase in construction costs; construction cost has increased approximately 25% during the last two years. The current estimated construction cost is \$30.4 million, and the total project cost is \$43.1 million. The total project cost includes the cost of preliminary engineering, acquiring right-of-way, and construction administration. The City of Rancho Cucamonga has already invested \$6.2 million in local funds for right-of-way acquisition and \$1 million for preliminary engineering. All technical studies for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) have been completed and approved by Caltrans. The Draft Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) should be ready for submittal to Caltrans by January, 2009. Design will be funded with local and Federal funds and is expected to be allocated in March 2009. Construction is expected to begin in June, 2011. In summary, additional Federal funds are needed to make up for the short fall due to the escalating cost of construction.

Funding Summary

City funds (Development Impact Fees)	\$4,500,000
Federal Appropriations (FY 2004)	\$ 800,000
Federal Appropriations (FY 2005)	\$ 500,000
Federal Appropriations (FY 2006)	\$ 500,000
Federal Appropriations (FY 2008)	\$ 750,000
TEA-LU (FY 2005-2009)	\$4,000,000
Est. Total Project Cost:	\$43.1 million

SANBAG STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

FY 2010 Federal Appropriations Cycle

- ***I-15 Corridor: Devore Interchange Improvements***
\$5 million (McKeon)

Project Description

This project will reconfigure the I-15/I-215 Interchange to provide four lanes in each direction on the I-15 Corridor through the interchange. The planning effort also will review the viability of adding truck lanes along I-15 to by pass the interchange. Measure I funds from 2010-2040 are being advanced to start work on preliminary engineering and environmental approval. The budgetary cost estimate is based on the Project Study Report and reflects the cost at the time of construction. Funding for this project needs to be identified and secured prior to beginning the final design in 2011.

This project will reconfigure the I-15/I-215 Interchange to provide four lanes in each direction on the I-15 Corridor through the interchange. The planning effort also will review the viability of adding truck lanes along I-15 to by pass the interchange. Measure I funds from 2010-2040 are being advanced to start work on preliminary engineering and environmental approval. The budgetary cost estimate is based on the Project Study Report and reflects the cost at the time of construction. Funding for this project needs to be identified and secured prior to beginning the final design in 2011.

Building this project will add a one-time benefit of \$437 million in economic output, 3,500 FTE one-year jobs, and \$144 million in wages. It will also generate at least \$11.98 million on state and \$1.74 million in local taxes. The cost of delay on the project is \$25 million per year based on the formula $\$12\text{-}\$15/\text{vehicle hour} \times 7500 \text{ vehicle hours/day} \times 250 \text{ weekdays/year} = \25 million .

Project History

SANBAG has designated the widening of Interstate 15 and the reconstruction of the Interstate 15/Interstate 215 Interchange in Devore as its highest priority through the Proposition 1B Trade Corridors Improvement Fund. This project will increase truck throughput and reduce delays in this heavily traveled section of San Bernardino County.

Project Status

SANBAG is currently in the preliminary engineering phase of the project. We are evaluating design alternatives and working on the environmental clearance document. We anticipate this will take until 2011.

Budgetary Estimate Summary (in \$000's)

Project Phase	Preliminary Engineering
Construction Start Date	November 2013

Est. Total Project Cost: \$375 million

Funding Summary (in \$000's)

Measure I	\$7,075
State – TCIF	\$118,012
Future Federal, State, Local	\$243,466
Total:	\$368,553

SANBAG STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

FY 2010 Federal Appropriations Cycle

- ***I-15 Corridor: La Mesa/Nisqualli Interchange***
\$5 million (McKeon)

Project Description

This project connects La Mesa Road and Nisqualli Road by constructing an over-crossing and interchange connection to Interstate 15 at what has become the urban/commercial core of the Victor Valley and provide an improved East-West corridor from the Town of Apple Valley. The interchange will serve as a conduit across the freeway and help disperse traffic from existing interchanges at Bear Valley Rd. and Palmdale Rd. that were not constructed to accommodate the massive population growth and commercial development that has occurred in the Victor Valley in past decade. The design and right of way phases are fully funded. The design is at 60% completion. Right of way certification is scheduled for February 2009. The construction contract is scheduled for award in November of 2009. SANBAG's "Nexus Study," a study to determine the fair share contributions from new development, identifies \$30 million in development mitigation funds for the construction phase. The City has already committed \$46,577 (50%) of local funds to the project. The remaining \$30 million public share of the construction cost needs funding.

Budgetary Estimate Summary (in \$000's)

Project Approval / Environmental Document	\$1,070
Final Design	\$5,238
Right of Way	\$27,049
Construction	<u>\$60,000</u>

Est. Total Project Cost: \$93,357

Funding Summary (in 000's)

Local – City	\$46,577
State – STIP	\$11,530
Federal Funding:	
Demo	\$1,200
RSTP	\$3,800
Section 115	<u>\$250</u>
Total Funds Committed	\$63,357

Total Funds needed \$30,000

SANBAG STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

FY 2010 Federal Appropriations Cycle

- ***I-15 Corridor: Ranchero Road Interchange***
\$3 million (Lewis)

Project Description

The Ranchero Road/Interstate 15 (I-15) Interchange Project proposes to construct a new over-crossing, entrance and exit ramps with Interstate 15 in Hesperia. East-west mobility and access to and from I-15 are among the most significant transportation deficiencies within the Victor Valley. With the completion of the Ranchero Rd. Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Undercrossing and the Ranchero Rd./I-15 Interchange, Ranchero Rd. will ultimately be widened from two lanes (one lane each direction) to six lanes and will serve as a super arterial roadway providing improved east-west mobility and access to I-15 to residents of Hesperia.

Project History

Ranchero Road Interchange is one of three phases of the Ranchero Road Corridor Project, which has been the City's highest priority transportation capital improvement project for the past several years. This is a regionally significant project that will improve East-West traffic circulation in the Victor Valley, reduce vehicle miles travelled, and improve safety response times for emergency vehicles.

Project Status

The project is currently in the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA/ED) phase and is estimated to cost \$60 million. The City has committed \$30 million of Development Impact Fees, Redevelopment Agency Bonds, and Local Measure I Pass-through Funds to the project, in addition to the \$7.03 million of Prop 1B STIP Augmentation funds that were allocated to the project by the SANBAG Board.

Project Phases

Phase I involves construction of a new undercrossing at the BNSF Railway right-of-way. This phase received environmental clearance from Caltrans, acting as National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) delegate to the Federal Highway Administration. Right-of way acquisition has begun, and design is nearing completion. Construction is slated to begin in 2009.

Phase II involves construction of a full-service interchange at Interstate 15, which will connect the improvements in phases I and III to the interstate system. This project is identified as Project SBD031279 in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program, and is currently in the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) phase.

Phase III involves widening of five miles of Ranchero Road from the new undercrossing, through the unincorporated San Bernardino County, to Interstate 15. Design of this phase is also underway at this time and is being done in cooperation with the County. Construction is tentatively scheduled for 2009-10.

This month, Caltrans approved the Geometric Approval Drawings, and have given bridge design-type approval as well. NEPA clearance is anticipated by spring 2009, with right-of-way acquisition to immediately follow, and design expected to be completed in late 2009. Construction can commence in 2010-2011. It is anticipated that this project will create up to 250 construction related jobs.

Est. Total Project Cost: \$62 million

SANBAG STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

FY 2010 Federal Appropriations Cycle

- **High Desert Corridor: Phase I/Interchange Project**
\$5 million (McKeon)

Project Description

HDC, Phase I, is the first segment of a new highway linking the Victor Valley in San Bernardino County with the Antelope Valley in Los Angeles County. This project will provide new freeway access from the I-15 freeway to U.S. 395 and will provide new highway access to Southern California Logistics Airport (formerly George Air Force Base).

This project will enhance plans to expand the multi-modal capability for goods movement, with the added benefit of ultimately creating 10,000 jobs. The project is currently estimated to cost \$900 million to construct from US-395 in Adelanto to SR-18 in Apple Valley. The project is currently in the Project Approval & Environmental Document phase.

Project History

The Antelope and Victor Valleys continue to experience explosive population growth, deficient highway infrastructure, and impacts from truck related goods movement that bypass the Los Angeles area's more congested freeways. The HDC first received funding in TEA21 for the section between U.S. 395 in Adelanto and State Route (SR) 18 in Apple Valley. SAFETEA-LU designated a portion of HDC as E-220, however no funding accompanied the designation. Most of the route identified as E-220 falls outside of HDC, Phase I. It is important to distinguish between the phases when considering funding for the project.

Project Status

SANBAG requests \$5 million for costs associated with planning and design implementation for Phase I. Local match from Apple Valley/Victorville for Federal Funds have been received in the amount of \$2,460,000. SANBAG's "Nexus Study," a study to determine the fair share contributions from new development, identified \$38,220,000 in development mitigation funds for this project.

Additional Project Information

While SANBAG's advocacy effort focuses on support for funding for Phase I of the High Desert Corridor, SANBAG also supports efforts to utilize public-private partnerships (P3's) authority to provide a broader array of funding types to support the delivery of this project.

Budgetary Estimate Summary (in \$000's)

Project Status	Project Development Stage
Project Phase	Current phase of project is in PA&ED
Construction Start Date	Late 2013

Est. Total Project Cost: \$900 million

Funding Summary

TEA-21 (Lewis)	\$7,500,000 – Phase I
SAFETEA-LU (Lewis)	\$4,000,000 – Phase I
SAFETEA-LU (McKeon)	\$800,000 – Phase II
2005 Federal Appropriations (Lewis)	\$3,000,000 – Phase I
2006 Public Lands (FHWA)	\$2,000,000 – Phase I

SANBAG STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

FY 2010 Federal Appropriations Cycle

Transit Program

- *Victor Valley Transit Facility*
\$3 million (Lewis)

Project Description

The new facility will be designed to accommodate an anticipated fleet of 145 vehicles in 2020. The Authority will be seeking a LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) rating of Silver for the new facility design. Requested appropriation amount of \$30 million from FTA 5309 Bus/Bus Facilities.

Project History

The Victor Valley Transit Authority completed a Facility Master Plan in October 2004. As a result of that study the Authority has purchased a 10 acre site within the City of Hesperia for the construction of a new facility to house administration, maintenance and operations functions. This new facility will replace the existing leased property consisting of a gravel lot, garage, small building and a trailer. The total amount being sought is \$30 million over multiple years.

Project Status

Complete construction documents for the facility project are in plan-check at the City of Hesperia. Site grading is complete; and the CNG fueling facility and some off-site improvements are under construction. Construction of the main facility is due to commence April, 2009. This project is estimated to create 250 jobs.

Budgetary Estimate Summary (in \$000's)

Project Phase	Phase I
Construction Start Date	Phase I – In progress
Phase II – Main Facility	April 2009
Est. Total Project Cost:	\$42 million

SANBAG STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

FY 2010 Federal Appropriations Cycle

- *San Bernardino Rapid Bus Project: sbX*
\$4 million (Baca)

Project Description

The San Bernardino Valley Express (sbX) will be the first of its kind to operate in the cities of San Bernardino and Loma Linda. sbX is a bus rapid transit (BRT) that will operate along "E" Street corridor between California State University, San Bernardino and Loma Linda University and the Jerry L. Pettis Memorial VA Medical Center in Loma Linda. BRT is a new high-tech, user-friendly system that will offer more frequent service, fewer stops, and higher average speeds than traditional bus service.

Project History

On December, 2005 a Major Investment Study was completed which resulted with Omnitrans, the City of San Bernardino, and the San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), adopting and approving the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). The LPA is the proposed alignment selected by several stakeholders and the general public whom were all involved in the two year process of selecting the LPA.

Project Status

SANBAG staff recommends requesting \$4.0 million for the construction portion of the project.

Funding Summary

\$ 400,000 in FY06 FTA Section 5307

\$2,400,000 in FY07 FTA Section 5307

Est. Total Project Cost: \$163 million

SANBAG STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

FY 2010 Federal Appropriations Cycle

Unidentified Funding Category

- **Motorist Safety Project: Chino Corona Road**
\$3 million (Miller)

Project Description

The Chino Corona Road project is located in the newly annexed area of the City of Chino. This area is experiencing and will continue to experience significant commercial, industrial and residential growth. The transition from agricultural land uses to more urbanized uses is putting pressure on the existing transportation and road systems in the area. The Chino Corona Road Improvements relieve a great deal of this pressure by providing a link between Hellman Ave. and Pine Ave. The improvements include a new bridge crossing over the natural drainage and low spot area along Chino Corona Road. Due to inadequate drainage system, this segment of roadway becomes flooded every rainy season and was the cause of at least one fatal accident in January 2008. Currently, this area is closed during any rain event due to possible flooding. Since this area has been recently annexed to the City, the Developer's contribution covers 50% of the estimate cost of \$6,000,000. No other funding is currently designated for this project.

Located between Pine Ave. and Hellman Ave., Chino Corona Rd. will ultimately develop into a regionally significant East-West bypass transportation corridor and alternate truck route for commercial, agricultural and residential vehicles operating in and around the South Preserve community. Construction of a new bridge will ensure emergency vehicles have direct access to the new Preserve community and surrounding areas during inclement weather. The full benefits of this corridor will be realized when the County of Riverside makes the connection with I-15 and the City of Chino completes the Pine Ave. Extension project. The end result would be development of additional commercial projects and the creation of numerous job opportunities for the region. Furthermore, the improved Chino Corona Rd. will provide a vital safe alternate route for commuters from the cities of Chino, Chino Hills, Corona and Norco between Hellman and Pine Avenues. Finally, this project would provide significant congestion relief to existing regional arterials and local roadways.

Est. Total Project Cost: \$6 million

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 5

Date: December 18, 2008

Subject: Guidelines for Identifying Potential Projects for the Multi-Year Federal Transportation Reauthorization Bill

Recommendation: *

1. Approve guidelines for identifying potential projects for Federal Reauthorization (Attachment #1); and
2. Receive update on input from SANBAG's policy committees.

Background: The current Federal Transportation Authorization Act, also known as the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA – LU), will expire after September 30, 2009. The national debate on the form, content, and funding provisions of the next authorization bill has already begun. This item is intended to seek Board approval for a set of guidelines that will assist in identifying potential projects for the federal reauthorization bill.

SANBAG staff recommends the Board adopt the guidelines outlined in Attachment #1 to identify potential projects for the next federal reauthorization bill. The proposed guidelines are not intended to be a rigid checklist, but rather a tool to identify the most competitive projects in the region, which will be competing against other projects across the nation. These guidelines will aid in developing solid justification for the universe of projects advocated for by SANBAG.

Approved
Commuter Rail Committee

Date: _____

Moved: _____ *Second:* _____

In Favor: _____ *Opposed:* _____ *Abstained:* _____

Witnessed: _____

SANBAG staff is working to develop a list of projects for the Board's review and approval and has been working with member jurisdiction to receive input.

Specific projects to consider as a part of this recommendation will be presented during future SANBAG meetings. SANBAG staff will continue to work with member jurisdictions to identify potential projects and will provide regular updates to the Board as the policy for SAFETEA-LU reauthorization takes shape.

Committee Feedback

During the month of November, this item was presented to the Administrative, Major Projects, Plans and Programs, and Mountain Desert Committees. Additionally, SANBAG staff contacted each member jurisdiction to request input.

The attached document (Attachment #1) has been modified to incorporate committee recommendations on the guidelines to identify potential projects for the next federal reauthorization bill.

A Primer on Authorization vs. Appropriations

The authorization process is different than the appropriations process. Since the 1990's, the transportation authorization process has occurred approximately every five to six years to provide a long-range spending plan for transportation. The current authorization authority for transportation is called Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), which will expire on September 30, 2009. SAFETEA-LU authorized formula spending, annual discretionary spending levels, and earmarks for specific projects; however, funds must be appropriated each year.

Anticipated Upcoming Schedule of Events

The House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee Chairman Jim Oberstar intends to release a "detailed summary" of the House transportation reauthorization bill at the end of February, followed by a series of trips around the country to build support for the bill. The Committee hopes to vote on the bill by mid-April, followed by a House floor vote before Memorial Day.

Senator Barbara Boxer, chair of the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee, has said she will follow the House, adding to the bill where Senate priorities are needed.

The next transportation authorization bill is likely to include an opportunity to advocate for specific projects. As such, SANBAG staff has developed guidelines to help identify potential projects for the federal reauthorization bill (please see Attachment #1).

Financial Impact: Funding for SANBAG's legislative program is consistent with the adopted SANBAG Budget Task No. 50309000. This item has potential benefits for SANBAG's transportation programs.

Reviewed By: This item is scheduled for review by the Plans and Programs Committee on December 17, 2008; Commuter Rail Committee on December 18, 2008; and Mountain/Desert Committee on December 19, 2008. The Administrative Committee reviewed and unanimously recommended approval of this item on December 10, 2008, and the Major Projects Committee reviewed and recommended approval 16-1-0 (Opposed: Gonzales) on December 11, 2008. A previous version of this agenda item was reviewed by the Administrative Committee, Major Projects Committee, and the Mountain Desert Committee in November.

Responsible Staff: Jennifer Franco, Director of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs

Guidelines for Identifying Projects for Federal Reauthorization

San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) is formulating a strategy for the next transportation authorization bill, which is likely to include an opportunity to advocate for specific projects. Please assist SANBAG with identifying potential projects that will improve and maintain our existing transportation infrastructure in a manner that meets regional and national priorities by utilizing the criteria below:

- ***The nominated project is in the latest approved, conforming Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) AND in the Measure I (2010-2040) Expenditure Plan. (YES/NO)***
Inclusion of a project in the approved, conforming RTP and in the Measure I expenditure plan demonstrates regional need, a financial commitment, and consistency with requirements to improve air quality.
- ***The nominated project has completed National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) clearance or is in the clearance process. (YES/NO)***
Projects that receive federal funds must complete the NEPA clearance process. Projects that have already completed or that are about to complete the NEPA process are considered more competitive.
- ***The nominated project is in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). (YES/NO)***
The RTIP is a 5- year programming document that includes all regionally significant projects, regardless of funding source. Candidate projects not in the RTIP would have to be amended in, resulting in delay.
- ***Federal funding for this project would save Measure I funds for other projects. (YES/NO)***
Federal funding for the nominated project would supplant Measure I funds, which could, in turn, be moved to other projects important to SANBAG.
- ***The nominated project is a freeway improvement, freeway interchange improvement, grade separation, rapid bus project (BRT), light rail, or commuter rail project. (YES/NO)***
According to SANBAG's Measure I strategic planning process, particular emphasis has been given to the types of projects listed above. Nominated projects fitting one of the above descriptions are also more likely to match priorities in the next federal authorization bill.
- ***The nominated project is on a trade corridor of national significance and/or a High Priority Corridor on the National Highway System. (YES/NO)***
Trade Corridors of National Significance are key freight corridors as defined by Congress, which includes I-10, I-15 and the Alameda Corridor East. Nominated projects along I-10 and I-15 may include interchange and mainline improvements. Alameda Corridor East grade separations also meet this criterion.
- ***Nominated Valley freeway interchanges: in the top 10 of the interchange prioritization list. (YES/NO)***
Nominated Valley freeway interchanges should be among the top 10 of SANBAG's interchange prioritization list.
- ***For Valley or Victor Valley interchanges or grade separations, the development share is committed. (YES/NO)***
The development share has been identified and committed for the nominated project.
- ***Nominated Grade Separations: top ten on prioritized list AND already federalized, OR amount of proposed federal funding more than offsets the reduction in railroad contribution and cost of delay associated with NEPA compliance. (YES/NO)***
Grade separation projects that are already federalized are preferred.
- ***The nominated project will be able to start construction by 2014-15. (YES/NO)***
The nominated project will have completed all pre-construction phases in time to begin construction by 2014.
- ***The nominated project is supported by multiple jurisdictions. (YES/NO)***
The nominated project is supported by multiple jurisdictions.
- ***Nominated the project is a vital connector for the highway system and/or inter-jurisdictional. (YES/NO)***
The nominated project is a vital connector to/from the state or federal highway system, which may also be a vital connector to the state. Vital connectors may also include projects that will enhance the inter-jurisdictional mobility.

- San Bernardino County Transportation Commission ■ San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
■ San Bernardino County Congestion Management Agency ■ Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

Minute Action

AGENDA ITEM: 6

Date: December 18, 2008

Subject: Release of the Draft Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan for Comment

Recommendation: Receive information on the Draft Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan Report and opening of the formal comment period.

Background: Development of the Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan was initiated in 2005 to define the policy framework for delivery of the projects and programs referenced in the new Measure. The Strategic Plan will be the policy manual for delivery of the Measure I programs by SANBAG and its member agencies.

Per previous discussions with SANBAG committees, staff is releasing the Draft Strategic Plan Report and initiating a formal comment period as part of the December 2008 agendas for the Commuter Rail Committee, Major Projects Committee, Mountain/Desert Committee, and Plans and Programs Committee. The report is attached as a separate document in this agenda packet. The report also has been distributed directly to local jurisdictions through a mailing to city managers as well as to transit agencies in San Bernardino County. In addition, the report was distributed to the Comprehensive Transportation Plan Technical Advisory Committee (CTP TAC) at its meeting on December 8. **Please remember to bring the copy of the draft report you received for the Major Projects Committee.**

Approved
Commuter Rail Committee

Date: _____

Moved: _____ *Second:* _____

In Favor: _____ *Opposed:* _____ *Abstained:* _____

Witnessed: _____

This distribution initiates a formal review and comment period on the Draft Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan. The closing date for comments is January 21, 2009. Written comments are requested and should be sent to Ty Schuiling, SANBAG Director of Planning and Programming. Following the close of comments, SANBAG staff will prepare a response to comments for February committee meetings and/or a Board workshop in mid-February. The final Strategic Plan Report will be prepared for March committee approval, with SANBAG Board approval scheduled for April 1, 2009.

During the comment period, SANBAG staff welcomes any questions, informal comments, and requests for meetings with individual jurisdictions and other interested parties. A workshop on the Draft Strategic Plan will be held for the CTP TAC on Monday, January 12, 2009 to provide a forum for agency interaction and discussion on the draft. Additional meetings may be scheduled to address issues specific to given subareas.

The Draft Strategic Plan Report is also available on the SANBAG website at www.sanbag.ca.gov. A link is provided on the website home page to enable downloading of all or a portion of the draft.

Approval of the Strategic Plan is needed approximately one year in advance of the initiation of the new Measure I in April 2010 so that the resources and systems can be put in place to manage the new Measure. Timely approval of the Strategic Plan will not only put in place the policies needed to guide the allocation of Measure I 2010-2040 funding, but will be a basis for budgeting resources for Fiscal Year 2009-2010, three months of which fall within the timeline of the new Measure.

Financial Impact: This item has no financial impact. However, the Strategic Plan, once approved, will serve as the guide for the allocation of Measure I 2010-2040 dollars for many years to come. The item is consistent with the approved Fiscal Year 2008-2009 SANBAG budget, Task 60909000.

Reviewed By: This item was reviewed by the Major Projects Committee on December 11, 2008 Plans and Programs Committee on December 17 2008, and will be reviewed by the Commuter Rail Committee on December 18, 2008 and Mountain/Desert Committee on December 19, 2008.

Responsible Staff: Steve Smith, Chief of Planning
Ryan Graham, Transportation Planning Analyst
Ty Schuiling, Director of Planning and Programming

AB	Assembly Bill
ACE	Alameda Corridor East
ACT	Association for Commuter Transportation
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
APTA	American Public Transportation Association
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
ATMIS	Advanced Transportation Management Information Systems
BAT	Barstow Area Transit
CAC	Call Answering Center
CALACT	California Association for Coordination Transportation
CALCOG	California Association of Councils of Governments
CALSAFE	California Committee for Service Authorities for Freeway Emergencies
CALTRANS	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CHP	California Highway Patrol
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality
CMP	Congestion Management Program
CNG	Compressed Natural Gas
COG	Council of Governments
CSAC	California State Association of Counties
CTA	California Transit Association
CTAA	Community Transportation Association of America
CTC	California Transportation Commission
CTC	County Transportation Commission
CTP	Comprehensive Transportation Plan
DMO	Data Management Office
DOT	Department of Transportation
E&H	Elderly and Handicapped
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ETC	Employee Transportation Coordinator
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FSP	Freeway Service Patrol
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FTIP	Federal Transportation Improvement Program
GFOA	Government Finance Officers Association
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HOV	High-Occupancy Vehicle
ICMA	International City/County Management Association
ICTC	Interstate Clean Transportation Corridor
IEEP	Inland Empire Economic Partnership
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
IIP/ITIP	Interregional Transportation Improvement Program
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems
IVDA	Inland Valley Development Agency
JARC	Job Access Reverse Commute
LACMTA	Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
LNG	Liquefied Natural Gas
LTF	Local Transportation Funds
MAGLEV	Magnetic Levitation
MARTA	Mountain Area Regional Transportation Authority
MBTA	Morongo Basin Transit Authority
MDAB	Mojave Desert Air Basin
MDAQMD	Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District
MIS	Major Investment Study
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding

MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MSRC	Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee
MTP	Metropolitan Transportation Plan
NAT	Needles Area Transit
OA	Obligation Authority
OCTA	Orange County Transportation Authority
OWP	Overall Work Program
PA&ED	Project Approval and Environmental Document
PASTACC	Public and Specialized Transportation Advisory and Coordinating Council
PDT	Project Development Team
PPM	Planning, Programming and Monitoring Funds
PSR	Project Study Report
PTA	Public Transportation Account
PVEA	Petroleum Violation Escrow Account
RCTC	Riverside County Transportation Commission
RDA	Redevelopment Agency
RFP	Request for Proposal
RIP	Regional Improvement Program
ROD	Record of Decision
RTAC	Regional Transportation Agencies' Coalition
RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RTPA	Regional Transportation Planning Agencies
SB	Senate Bill
SAFE	Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
SANBAG	San Bernardino Associated Governments
SCAB	South Coast Air Basin
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCRRA	Southern California Regional Rail Authority
SED	Socioeconomic Data
SHA	State Highway Account
SHOPP	State Highway Operations and Protection Program
SOV	Single-Occupant Vehicle
S RTP	Short Range Transit Plan
STAF	State Transit Assistance Funds
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
STP	Surface Transportation Program
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TCM	Transportation Control Measure
TCRP	Traffic Congestion Relief Program
TDA	Transportation Development Act
TEA	Transportation Enhancement Activities
TEA-21	Transportation Equity Act for the 21 st Century
TIA	Traffic Impact Analysis
TMC	Transportation Management Center
TMEE	Traffic Management and Environmental Enhancement
TOC	Traffic Operations Center
TOPRS	Transit Operator Performance Reporting System
TSM	Transportation Systems Management
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
UZAs	Urbanized Areas
VCTC	Ventura County Transportation Commission
VVTA	Victor Valley Transit Authority
WRCOG	Western Riverside Council of Governments

San Bernardino Associated Governments



MISSION STATEMENT

To enhance the quality of life for all residents,
San Bernardino Associated Governments
(SANBAG) will:

- Improve cooperative regional planning
- Develop an accessible, efficient,
multi-modal transportation system
- Strengthen economic development
efforts
- Exert leadership in creative problem
solving

To successfully accomplish this mission,
SANBAG will foster enhanced relationships
among all of its stakeholders while adding
to the value of local governments.

Approved June 2, 1993
Reaffirmed March 6, 1996